

STEVEN G. KALAR
Federal Public Defender
GALIA AMRAM (CABN 250551)
Assistant Federal Public Defender
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36106
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7700
Facsimile: (415) 436-7706
Galia_Amram@fd.org
Counsel for Defendant Adam SHAFI

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADAM SHAFI,

Defendant.

No. 15-CR-582 WHO

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE**

I. STIPULATION

The parties in this case agree and jointly request the Court to move the status conference scheduled in the above captioned case from June 23, 2016 to September 1, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

The reason for this request is that defense counsel was recently appointed and requires additional time to review discovery. In addition, defense counsel is travelling from August 8, 2016 to August 19, 2016, and the Court is unavailable on August 25, 2016.

The parties concur that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel and continuity of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. §

1 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties agree that the nature of the prosecution (i.e., terrorism charge
 2 involving Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act information) make the case "complex" under the
 3 Speedy Trial Act. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). The parties also agree that the end of
 4 justice served by granting such an exclusion of time for the purposes of effective preparation of
 5 counsel outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §
 6 3161(h)(7)(A).

7
 8
 9 DATED: June 20, 2016

_____/s/_____
 WAQAR HASIB
 JEFFREY SHIH
 Assistant United States Attorneys

10
 11
 12
 13 DATED: June 20, 2016

_____/s/_____
 GALIA AMRAM
 Attorney for Defendant Adam Shafi


14
 15
 16
 17 **ORDER**

18 For the reasons stated above the Court hereby CONTINUES the status hearing in the
 19 aforementioned case from June 23, 2016 to September 1, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. The Court further
 20 finds that the exclusion from the time limits of this period applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 is
 21 warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of
 22 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Additionally, the nature of the prosecution makes
 23 the case complex such that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial
 24 proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established in the Speedy Trial Act. 18
 25 U.S.C. § (h)(7)(B)(ii). Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the defendant
 26
 27
 28

1 effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. §
2 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4
5 DATED: June 20, 2016

6 
7 THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28